arXiv:1212.4281v1 [math.PR] 18 Dec 2012

EXPONENTIAL APPROXIMATION OF EMPIRICAL NEIGHBORHOOD MEASURES OF RANDOM GRAPHS BY RANDOM ALLOCATION

By Kwabena Doku-Amponsah

Abstract

In this article we correct a conjecture in [DM06a, Remark 3] and, improve the proof of the large deviation principle for empirical neigbourhood measure of coloured random graphs conditioned to a given empirical colour measure and empirical pair measure. Using this result, we found a large deviation principle for the empirical degree distribution of an Erdos-Renyi graphs, where nc edges are inserted at random among n vertices. We show that, for any degree distribution d, the solution to the variational formulation of the rate function in [BGL02, Theorem 7.1] is the relative entropy of d with respect to the Poisson distribution with mean c.

1. Introduction

1.1 The coloured random graph model. In this subsection, we review the *coloured random graph model* as in [DM06a]. We begin by fixing the following notations. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a finite alphabet or colour set $\mathcal{X}$. Let V be a fixed set of n vertices, say $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_n$ the set of all (simple) graphs with vertex set $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and edge set $E \subset \mathcal{E} := \big\{(u, v) \in V \times V \, : \, u < v\big\}$, where the *formal* ordering of edges is introduced as a means to simply describe *unordered* edges.

Given a symmetric function $p_n \colon \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to [0, 1]$ and a probability measure μ on $\mathcal{X}$ we may define the *randomly coloured random graph* or simply *coloured random graph* X with n vertices as follows: Assign to each vertex $v \in V$ colour $X(v)$ independently according to the *colour law* μ. Given the colours, we connect any two vertices $u, v \in V$, independently of everything else, with a *connection probability* $p_n(X(u), X(v))$ otherwise keep them disconnected. We always consider $X = ((X(v) \, : \, v \in V), E)$ under the joint law of graph and colour. We interpret X as coloured random graph and consider $X(v)$ as the colour of the vertex v. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_n(\mathcal{X})$ the set of all coloured graphs with colour set $\mathcal{X}$ and n vertices. See, [CP03] or [Pe98].

Our interest in this article is on the coloured random graph models in the *near-critical* critical regimes. Thus, we look at cases when the connection probabilities satisfy $np_n(a, b) \to C(a, b)$, for all $a, b \in \mathcal{X}$, and $C \colon \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to [0, \infty)$.

For any finite or countable set $\mathcal{Y}$ we denote by $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y})$ the space of probability measures, and by $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{Y})$ the space of finite measures on $\mathcal{Y}$ and we endow it with the weak topology. Further, we denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_*(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})$ the subspace of symmetric measures in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y})$.

Mathematics Subject Classification : 60F10, 05C80

Keywords: concentration inequalities, coupling, empirical occupancy process,empirical degree distribution, sparse random graphs, bins and balls model.

For any coloured graph $X = ((X(v) : v \in V), E)$ with n vertices we recall the definition of the *empirical colour measure* $L^1 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$, by

$$L^1(a) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{v\in V}\delta_{X(v)}(a), \qquad \text{for } a \in \mathcal{X},$$

and the *empirical pair measure* $L^2 \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_*(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X})$, by

$$L^2(a,b) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{(u,v)\in E}[\delta_{(X(v),\,X(u))} + \delta_{(X(u),\,X(v))}](a,b), \qquad \text{for } a,b \in \mathcal{X}.$$

We observe that by definition L^2 is finite symmetric measure with total mass $\|L^2\|$ equal to $2|E|/n$. Finally we recall the definition of the *empirical neighbourhood measure* $M \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}))$, by

$$M(a,\ell) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{v\in V}\delta_{(X(v),L(v))}(a,\ell), \qquad \text{for } (a,\ell) \in \mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}),$$

where $L(v) = (l^v(b),\, b \in \mathcal{X})$ and $l^v(b)$ is the number of vertices of colour b connected to vertex v. For every $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}))$ let ν_1, ν_2 be the $\mathcal{X}$-marginal, respectively the $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})-$marginal, of the measure ν. Moreover, we define a measure $\langle\nu(\cdot,\ell),\, \ell(\cdot)\rangle \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X})$ by

$$\langle\nu(\cdot,\ell),\, \ell(\cdot)\rangle(a,b) := \sum_{\ell\in\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})}\nu(a,\ell)\ell(b), \qquad \text{for } a,b \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Define the function $\Phi\colon \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})) \to \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})\times\tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X})$ by $\Phi(\nu) = (\nu_1, \langle\nu(\cdot,\ell),\, \ell(\cdot)\rangle)$, and observe that $\Phi(M) = (L^1, L^2)$, if these quantities are defined as empirical neighbourhood, colour, and pair measures of a coloured graph. Note that while the *first* component of Φ is a continuous function, the *second* component is *discontinuous* in the weak topology.

We call a pair of measures $(\varpi,\nu) \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X})\times\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}))$ *sub-consistent* if

$$\langle\nu(\cdot,\ell),\, \ell(\cdot)\rangle(a,b) \le \varpi(a,b), \qquad \text{for all } a,b \in \mathcal{X}, \tag{1.1}$$

and *consistent* if equality holds in (1.1).

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{X}) &:= \big\{\omega \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}) \,:\, n\omega(a) \in \mathbb{N} \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{X}\big\},\\ \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_n(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X}) &:= \big\{\varpi \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_*(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X}) \,:\, \tfrac{n}{1+1\!\!1\{a=b\}}\,\varpi(a,b) \in \mathbb{N} \text{ for all } a,b \in \mathcal{X}\big\},\end{aligned}$$

1.2 The conditional coloured random graph models. Throughout the proof we may assume that $\omega(a) > 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{X}$. It is easy to see that the law of the randomly coloured graph conditioned to have empirical colour measure ω_n and empirical pair measure ϖ_n,

$$\mathbb{P}_{(\omega_n,\varpi_n)} = \mathbb{P}\{\,\cdot \mid \Phi(M) = (\omega_n,\varpi_n)\},$$

can be described in the following manner:

- Assign colours to the vertices by sampling without replacement from the collection of n colours, which contains any colour $a \in \mathcal{X}$ exactly $n\omega_n(a)$ times;
- for every unordered pair $\{a,b\}$ of colours create exactly $n(a,b)$ edges by sampling without replacement from the pool of possible edges connecting vertices of colour a and b, where

$$m_n(a,b) := \begin{cases} n\,\varpi_n(a,b) & \text{if } a \ne b\\ \frac{n}{2}\,\varpi_n(a,b) & \text{if } a = b\,. \end{cases}$$

2. Main Results

2.1 Exponential approximation by random allocation. In order to improve(shorten) the proof of Theorem 3.1, we pass to a simple *random allocation model*, which turns out to be equivalent. This model is best described in term of coloured balls being placed randomly into coloured bins.

Fix $n \geq 1$, a colour law $\omega_n \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{X})$ and an edge law $\varpi_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$. The bins $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ are now coloured by drawing without replacement from the collection of colours, which contains the colour $a \in \mathcal{X}$ exactly $n\omega_n(a)$ times. For every ordered pair $(a, b) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ of colours, we independently place $n\varpi_n(a, b)/2$ balls of colour b into the $n\omega_n(a)$ bins of colour a by drawing without replacement. We denote by $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}$ the distribution of the random allocation model with colour law $\omega_n \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{X})$ and an edge law $\varpi_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$.

In the resulting constellation we denote, for any bin $v \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, by $X(v)$ its colour, and by $l^v(b)$ the number of balls of colour $b \in \mathcal{X}$ it contains. Now deine the *empirical occupancy measure* of the constellation by

$$\tilde{M}(a, \ell) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V} \delta_{(\tilde{X}(v), \tilde{L}(v))}(a, \ell), \qquad \text{for } (a, \ell) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}),$$

where $\tilde{L}(v) = (l^v(b), b \in \mathcal{X})$ is the colour distribution in bin v. In our first theorem we establish exponential equivalence of the law of the empirical occupancy measure $\tilde{M}$ under the random allocation model $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}$ and the law of the empirical neighbourhood measure M under

$$\mathbb{P}_{(\omega_n,\varpi_n)} = \mathbb{P}\{\,\cdot \mid \Phi(M) = (\omega_n, \varpi_n)\},$$

the law of the randomly coloured graph conditioned to have colour law ω_n and edge distribution ϖ_n. Recall the definition of exponential equivalence, see [DZ98, Definition 4.2.10].

Theorem 2.1. *The law of* $\tilde{M}$ *under* $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}$ *is exponentially equivalent to the law of* M *under* $\mathbb{P}_{(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}$.

We define the *degree distribution* $D \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})$ of the coloured random graph by

$$D(k) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})} \delta_k\big(\textstyle\sum_{b \in \mathcal{X}} \ell(b)\big)\, M(a, \ell), \qquad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose* D *is the degree distribution of an Erdős-Rényi graph, where* $[nc]$ *edges are inserted at random among n vertices. Then* D *satisfies a large deviation principle, as* $n \to \infty$, *in the space* $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})$ *with good, convex rate function*

$$\delta(d) = \begin{cases} H(d \,\|\, q_c), & \textit{if } \langle d \rangle \leq c, \\ \infty & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where q_x *is a Poisson distribution with parameter* x.

Here we remark, that the LDP result of [BGL02, Theorem 7.1] holds and the conjecture that [BGL02, Theorem 7.2] does not hold is false. In fact the coupling argument of [BGL02] and Bennet's inequality, see [Be62], proves Theorem 7.1 of [BGL02]. We define the function I by

$$I(\eta) = \begin{cases} \int_0^c H(\eta_t^{\eta} \,\|\, \eta_t)dt, & \text{if } \eta \text{ is absolutely continuous,} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Theorem 2.3.

$$\inf\Big\{I(\eta) : \eta \in D_{\mathcal{M}}([0, 2c],\ \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}),\ \eta_{2c} = d\Big\} = \delta(d).$$

Remark 1 The proof of this theorem follows from the LDPs for the degree distribution of an Erdős-Rényi graph, where $[nc]$ edges are inserted at random among n vertices, due to Theorem 2.2 and the results of [BGL02, Theorem 7.1].

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1, THEOREM 2.2 AND THEOREM 2.3

3.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Define the metric d of total variation by

$$d(\nu,\tilde{\nu})=\tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{(a,\ell)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})}|\nu(a,\ell)-\tilde{\nu}(a,\ell)|,\qquad\text{for }\nu,\tilde{\nu}\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})).$$

As this metric generates the weak topology, the proof of Lemma 2.1 is equivalent to showing that for every $\varepsilon>0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\tfrac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\big\{d(\tilde{M}\,,\,M)\geq\varepsilon\big\}=-\infty,\tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathbb{P}$ indicates a suitable coupling between the random allocation model and the coloured graph.

Proof.

To begin, denote by $V(a)$ the collection of vertices (bins) which have colour $a\in\mathcal{X}$ and observe that

$$\sharp V(a)=n\omega_n(a).$$

For every $a,b\in\mathcal{X}$, begin: At each step $k=1,\dots,m_n(a,b)$, we randomly pick two vertices $V_1^k\in V(a)$ and $V_2^k\in V(b)$. Drop one ball of colour b in bin V_1^k and one ball of colour a in V_2^k, and link V_1^k to V_2^k by an edge unless $V_1^k=V_2^k$ or the two vertices are already connected. If one of these two things happen, then we simply choose an edge randomly from the set of all possible edges connecting colours a and b, which are not yet present in the graph. This completes the construction of a graph with $L^1(X)=\omega_n$, $L^2(X)=\varpi_n$ and

$$d(M\,,\,\tilde{M})\leq\tfrac{2}{n}\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}B^n(a,b)\,,\tag{3.2}$$

where $B^n(a,b)$ is the total number of steps $k\in\{1,\dots,m_n(a,b)\}$ at which there is disparity between the vertices V_1^k, V_2^k drawn and the vertices which formed the k^{th} edge connecting a and b in the random graph construction.

Given $a,b\in\mathcal{X}$,the probability that $V_1^k=V_2^k$ or the two vertices are already connected is equal to

$$p_{[k]}(a,b):=\tfrac{1}{m_n(a,b)}1\!\!1_{\{a=b\}}+\big(1-\tfrac{1}{m_n(a,b)}1\!\!1_{\{a=b\}}\big)\tfrac{(k-1)}{(m_n(a,b))^2}.$$

$B^n(a,b)$ is a sum of independent Bernoulli random variables X_1, ..., $X_{n\varpi_n(a,b)/2}$ with 'success' probabilities equal to $p_{[1]}(a,b),\dots,p_{[n\varpi_n(a,b)/2]}(a,b)$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[X_k]=p_{[k]}(a,b)$ and

$$Var[X_k]=p_{[k]}(a,b)(1-p_{[k]}(a,b)).$$

Now, we have

$$\mathbb{E}B^n(a,b)=\sum_{k=1}^{n(a,b)}p_{[k]}(a,b)=1\!\!1_{\{a=b\}}+\big(1-1\!\!1_{\{a=b\}}\tfrac{1}{m_n(a,b)}\big)\big(1-\tfrac{1}{m_n(a,b)}\big)\leq 1+1\!\!1_{\{a=b\}}.$$

We write

$$\sigma_n^2(a,b):=\tfrac{1}{m_n(a,b)}\sum_{k=1}^{m_n(a,b)}Var[X_k]$$

and observe that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}(B^n(a,b))=\lim_{n\to\infty}Var(B^n(a,b))=\lim_{n\to\infty}m_n(a,b)\sigma_n^2(a,b)=\mathbb{1}_{\{a=b\}}+1.$$

We Define $h(x)=(1+x)\log(1+x)-x$, for $x\geq 0$ and use Bennett's inequality, see [Be62], to obtain, for sufficiently large n

$$\mathbb{P}\Big\{\tfrac{B^n(a,b)}{n}\geq\tfrac{\mathbb{1}_{\{a=b\}}+1}{n}+\delta_1\Big\}\leq exp\Big[-m_n(a,b)\sigma_n^2(a,b)h(\tfrac{n\delta_1}{n(a,b)\sigma_n^2(a,b)})\Big],$$

for any $\delta_1>0$. Let $\varepsilon\geq 0$ and choose $\delta_1=\frac{\varepsilon}{2m^2}$. Suppose that we have $B^n(a,b)\leq\delta$. Then, by (3.2),

$$d(M(X),\nu_n)\leq 2\delta_1 m^2=\varepsilon.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\big\{d(M,\tilde{M})>\varepsilon\big\}\leq\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\mathbb{P}\big\{B^n(a,b)\geq n\delta_1\big\}&\leq m^2\sup_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\mathbb{P}\big\{B^n(a,b)\geq\mathbb{1}_{\{a=b\}}+1+(n\delta_1)/2\big\}\\&\leq m^2\sup_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}exp\Big[-m_n(a,b)\sigma_n^2(a,b)h(\tfrac{n\delta_1}{m_n(a,b)\sigma_n^2(a,b)})\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Let $0\leq\delta_2\leq 1$. The, for sufficiently large n we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{n}\log\mathbb{P}\Big\{d(M(X),\tilde{M}(X))>\varepsilon\Big\}\leq-(1-\delta_2)h(\tfrac{n\delta_1}{2(1+\delta_2)})\\&\quad=-(\mathbb{1}_{\{a=b\}}+1-\delta_2)\Big[(\tfrac{1}{n}+\tfrac{\delta_1}{2(\mathbb{1}_{\{a=b\}}+1+\delta_2)})\log(1+\tfrac{n\delta_1}{2(\mathbb{1}_{\{a=b\}}+1+\delta_2)})-\tfrac{\delta_1}{2(\mathbb{1}_{\{a=b\}}+1+\delta_2)}\Big].\end{aligned}\tag{3.3}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. ■

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2.

As the degree distribution D is a continuous function of M, Theorem 3.1 below and the contraction principle imply a large deviation principle for D. This Theorem is a special case of Theorem 3.1 which was first proved in [DM06a] abeit a number approximation steps, some of which are not too easy to understand. See, example [DM06a, Lemma 4.10, p.26-29]. Note, that in special case of classical Erdős-Rényi graph we have that $M=D$ the degree distribution and

$$\langle\Phi(M)\rangle=|E|/n=c.$$

Theorem 3.1 (DM06a)**.** *Suppose the sequence* $(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\in\mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{X})\times\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_n(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X})$ *converges to a limit* $(\omega,\varpi)\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})\times\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_*(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X})$. *Let* X *be a coloured random graph with* n *vertices conditioned on the event* $\{\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\}$. *Then, as* $n\to\infty$, *the empirical neighbourhood measure* M *of* X *satisfies a large deviation principle in the space* $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}))$ *with good rate function*

$$\tilde{J}_{(\omega,\varpi)}(\nu)=\begin{cases}H(\nu\,\|\,Q) & \textit{if } (\varpi,\nu) \textit{ is sub-consistent and } \nu_1=\omega\\ \infty & \textit{otherwise.}\end{cases}\tag{3.4}$$

Now Lemma 2.1 and the large deviation principle for $\tilde{M}$ under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}$ implies the same large deviation principle for M under $\mathbb{P}_{(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}$ in the weak topology. See,for example [DZ98, Theorem 4.2.13]. Consequently, the proof of Theorem 3.1 is equivalent to showing that for every $\Gamma\subset\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}))$,

Lemma 3.2.

$$-\inf_{\nu\in int(\Gamma)}\tilde{J}_{(\omega,\varpi)}(\nu)\le\liminf_{n\to\infty}\tfrac{1}{n}\log\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big\{M\in\Gamma\,\Big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\Big\}$$
$$\le\limsup_{n\to\infty}\tfrac{1}{n}\log\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big\{M\in\Gamma\,\Big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\Big\}\le-\inf_{\nu\in cl(\Gamma)}\tilde{J}_{(\omega,\varpi)}(\nu). \qquad (3.5)$$

We begin the proof of (3.5) by recalling the definition of Φ a function on $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}))$ given by $\nu\mapsto(\nu_1,\sum\ell(\cdot)\nu(\cdot,\ell))$. Let $(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\to(\omega,\varpi)\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})\times\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X})$ and write

$$\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)=\big\{\nu_n:\nu_n=M,\ \Phi(\nu_n)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n),\ for\ some\ random\ allocations\ process\ on\ n\ bins\ \big\}.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{S}(\nu)$ the support of ν and write for $\nu_n\in\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)$,

$$\vartheta_1^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)=n\alpha_1^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)-n\beta_1^{(n)}(\nu_n)-\tfrac{1}{2n}|\mathcal{S}(\nu_n)|\log 2\pi n,$$

where

$$\alpha_1^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)=-\tfrac{1}{n}\log|\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)|+\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\log\varpi_n(a,b)+\tfrac{1}{2n}\big(|\mathcal{X}|+|\mathcal{X}|^2\big)\log 2\pi n$$
$$+\tfrac{1}{n^2}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\tfrac{1}{12\omega_n(a)+1/n}+\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\log\omega_n(a)+\tfrac{1}{n^2}\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\tfrac{1}{12\varpi_n(a,b)+1/n},$$

$$\beta_1^{(n)}(\nu_n)=\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\substack{(a,\ell)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})\\ \nu_n(a,\ell)>0}}\log\nu_n(a,\ell)+\tfrac{1}{n^2}\sum_{\substack{(a,\ell)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})\\ \nu_n(a,\ell)>0}}\tfrac{1}{12\nu_n(a,\ell)+1/n}.$$

We write $\vartheta_2^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)=n\alpha_2^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)-n\beta_2^{(n)}(\nu_n)$, where

$$\alpha_2^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)=\tfrac{1}{n}\log|\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)|+\tfrac{1}{n^2}\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\tfrac{1}{12\varpi_n(a,b)}+\tfrac{1}{n^2}\sum_{\substack{a\in\mathcal{X}\\ \omega_n(a)>0}}\tfrac{1}{12\omega_n(a)}+\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\log\varpi_n(a,b)$$
$$+\tfrac{1}{2n}\big(|\mathcal{X}|+|\mathcal{X}|^2\big)\log 2\pi n+\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\log\omega_n(a),$$

$$\beta_2^{(n)}(\nu_n)=\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\substack{(a,\ell)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})\\ \nu_n(a,\ell)>0}}\log\nu_n(a,\ell)\big)+\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\substack{(a,\ell)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})\\ \nu_n(a,\ell)>0}}\tfrac{1}{12\nu_n(a,\ell)}$$

We prove (3.5) above from the following lemma based on the idea of the method of types. see, [DZ98, Chapter 2].

Lemma 3.3. *For any* $\nu_n\in\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)$,

$$e^{-nH(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)+\vartheta_1^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)}\le\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\big\{M=\nu_n\,\big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\big\}\le|\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)|^{-1}e^{-nH(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)+\vartheta_2^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)},$$

where

$$Q_n(a\,,\,\ell)=\omega_n(a)\prod_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\frac{e^{-\varpi_n(a,b)/\omega_n(a)}[\varpi_n(a,b)/\omega_n(a)]^{\ell(b)}}{\ell(b)!},\ for\ \ell\in\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\vartheta_2^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\vartheta_1^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)=0$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma is based on the method of types, see, [DZ98, Chapter 2], combinatoric argument and good estimates from refined Stirling's formula.
We denote by $\tilde{x}$ the random allocation process and observe that for any $\nu_n \in \mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n, \varpi_n)$ we have

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\big\{\tilde{M} = \nu_n \,\big|\, \Phi(\tilde{M}) = (\omega_n, \varpi_n)\big\} = \frac{\sharp\big\{\tilde{x} : \tilde{M}(\tilde{x}) = \nu_n,\, \Phi(\tilde{M}) = (\omega_n, \varpi_n)\big\}}{\sharp\big\{\tilde{x} : (L^1(\tilde{x}), L^2(\tilde{x})) = (\omega_n, \varpi_n)\big\}}. \tag{3.6}$$

Now, the right side of (3.6) may be evaluated in the following way:

- For a given empirical measure ν_n with $\Phi(\nu_n) = (\omega_n, \varpi_n)$ there are

  $$\prod_{a\in\mathcal{X}} \binom{n\omega_n(a))}{n\nu_n(a,\ell),\ \ell \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})} \prod_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}} \binom{n\varpi_n(a,b)}{\ell_a^{(j)}(b),\ j = 1, ..., n\omega_n(a)}$$

  equally likely random allocation processes and
- for every empirical and empirical pair measure $\Phi(\nu_n) = (\omega_n, \varpi_n)$ there are $\prod_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}} \Big(n\omega_n(a)\Big)^{n\varpi_n(a,b)}$ equally likely random allocation processes

Therefore, (3.6) is equivalent to

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\big\{\tilde{M} = \nu_n \,\big|\, \Phi(\tilde{M}) = (\omega_n, \varpi_n)\big\} \tag{3.7}$$

$$= \prod_{a\in\mathcal{X}} \binom{n\omega_n(a))}{n\nu_n(a,\ell),\ \ell \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})} \prod_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}} \binom{n\varpi_n(a,b)}{\ell_a^{(j)}(b),\ j = 1, ..., n\omega_n(a)} \Big(\frac{1}{n\omega_n(a)}\Big)^{n\varpi_n(a,b)}, \tag{3.8}$$

while $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\big\{\tilde{M} = \nu_n \,\big|\, \Phi(\tilde{M}) = (\omega_n, \varpi_n)\big\} = 0$ when $\Phi(\nu_n) \neq (\omega_n, \varpi_n)$ by convention.

Suppose $\varpi_n(a,b) = 0$, for some $a, b \in \mathcal{X}$ then

$$\binom{n\varpi_n(a,b)}{\ell_a^{(j)}(b),\ j = 1, ..., n\omega_n(a)} = 1. \tag{3.9}$$

Suppose $\varpi_n(a,b) > 0$, a good estimate of $(n\varpi_n(a,b))!$ can be obtained from the refined Stirling's approximation, as

$$\exp\Big(n\varpi_n(a,b)\log n\varpi_n(a,b) - n\varpi_n(a,b) + \tfrac{1}{2}\log\varpi_n(a,b) + \tfrac{1}{12n\varpi_n(a,b)+1} + \tfrac{1}{2}\log 2n\pi\Big) \leq (n\varpi_n(a,b))!$$
$$\leq \exp\Big(n\varpi_n(a,b)\log n\varpi_n(a,b) - n\varpi_n(a,b) + \tfrac{1}{2}\log\varpi_n(a,b) + \tfrac{1}{12n\varpi_n(a,b)} + \tfrac{1}{2}\log 2\pi n).$$

Similarly, from the refined Stirling's approximation, see [Fe67, p. 52], we have

---

$(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n+1/(12n+1)} < n! < (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n+1/(12n)}$, see [?, page 52].

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp\Big(n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\omega_n(a)\log\omega_n(a)-n\sum_{(a,\ell)}\nu_n(a,\ell)\log\nu_n(a,\ell)+\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\tfrac{1}{12\omega_n(a)+1/n}+\tfrac{|\mathcal{X}|-|\mathcal{S}(\nu_n)|}{2}\log 2\pi n\Big)\\
&\times\exp\Big(-\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\substack{(a,\ell)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})\\ \nu_n(a,\ell)>0}}\tfrac{1}{12\nu_n(a,\ell)+1/n}\Big)\le\prod_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\binom{n\omega_n(a)}{n\nu_n(a,\ell),\ \ell\in\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})}\le\exp\Big(n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\omega_n(a)\log\omega_n(a)\Big)\\
&\times\exp\Big(-n\sum_{(a,\ell)}\nu_n(a,\ell)\log\nu_n(a,\ell)-\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{\substack{(a,\ell)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})\\ \nu_n(a,\ell)>0}}\tfrac{1}{12\nu_n(a,\ell)}+\tfrac{|\mathcal{X}|-|\mathcal{S}(\nu_n)|}{2}\log 2\pi n+\tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\tfrac{1}{12\omega_n(a)}\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{3.10}$$

We observe that $\prod_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\prod_{j=1}^{n\omega_n(a)}\ell_a^{(j)}(b)!=\prod_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\exp\big(n\sum_{(a,\ell)}(\log\ell(b)!)\nu_n(a,b)\big)$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp\Big(\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\big[n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)\log\varpi_n(a,b)-n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)-n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)\log\omega_n(a)\big]+\tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\log\varpi_n(a,b)\Big)\\
&\times\exp\Big(n\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\sum_{(a,\ell)}(\log\ell(b)!)\nu_n(a,\ell)+\tfrac{|\mathcal{X}|^2}{2}\log 2\pi n+\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\tfrac{1}{12n\varpi_n(a,b)+1}\Big)\\
&\le\prod_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\binom{n\varpi_n(a,b)}{\ell_a^{(j)}(b),\ j=1,...,n\omega_n(a)}\Big(\frac{1}{n\omega_n(a)}\Big)^{n\varpi_n(a,b)}\\
&\le\exp\Big(n\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\sum_{(a,\ell)}(\log\ell(b)!)\nu_n(a,\ell)+\tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\log\varpi_n(a,b)\Big)\\
&\times\exp\Big(\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\big[n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)\log\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)-n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)-n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)\log\omega_n(a)\big]+\sum_{a,b\in\mathcal{X}}\tfrac{1}{12n\varpi_n(a,b)}\Big)\\
&\times\exp\Big(\tfrac{|\mathcal{X}|^2}{2}\log 2\pi n\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together and choosing $\vartheta_1^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)$ and $\vartheta_2^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)$ appropriately, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp\Big(nH(\nu_n)+\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\big[n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)\log\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)-n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)-n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)\log\omega_n(a)\big]\Big)\\
&\times\exp\Big(-nH(\omega)-n\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\sum_{(a,\ell)}(\log\ell(b)!)\nu_n(a,\ell)+\vartheta_1^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)\Big)\le\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\big\{M=\nu_n\,\big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\big\}\\
&\le\exp\Big(-nH(\omega)-\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\big[n\sum_{(a,\ell)}(\log\ell(b)!)\nu_n(a,\ell)-n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)-n\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)\log\omega_n(a)\big]\Big)\\
&\times\exp\Big(nH(\nu_n)+n\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)\log\sum_{a\in\mathcal{X}}\varpi_n(a,b)-\log|\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)|+\vartheta_2^{(n)}(\varpi_n,\nu_n)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Collecting and rearranging terms properly and using $\Phi(\nu_n)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&H(\omega_n)-H(\nu_n)-\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\Big[\sum_{(a,\ell)}\ell(b)\nu_n(a,\ell)\log\sum_{(a,\ell)}\ell(b)\nu_n(a,\ell)-\sum_{(a,\ell)}\ell(b)\nu_n(a,\ell)-\sum_{(a,\ell)}\ell(b)\nu_n(a,\ell)\log\omega_n(a)\\
&-\sum_{(a,\ell)}(\log\ell(b)!)\nu_n(a,\ell)\Big]\\
&=\sum_{(a,\ell)}\nu_n(a,\ell)\Big[\log\nu_n(a,\ell)-\log\omega_n(a)-\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\Big(\log\big(\tfrac{\varpi_n(a,b)}{\omega_n(a)}\big)^{\ell(b)}-\tfrac{\varpi_n(a,b)}{\omega_n(a)}-\log\sum_{\ell}(\log\ell(b)!)\Big)\Big]\\
&=\sum_{(a,\ell)}\nu_n(a,\ell)\Big[\log\nu_n(a,\ell)-\log\big(\omega_n(a)\prod_{b\in\mathcal{X}}\tfrac{(\varpi_n(a,b)/\omega_n(a))^{\ell(b)}\exp(-\varpi_n(a,b)/\omega_n(a))}{\ell(b)!}\big)\Big]\\
&=H(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 3.3. □

We prove from Lemma 3.3 and [DM06a, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.4], upper bounds and lower bounds in the large deviation principle for all finite n. Let $\Gamma\subset\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}))$. Then (3.3) gives the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big\{M\in\Gamma\,\Big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\Big\}&=\sum_{\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\big\{M=\nu_n\,\big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\big\}\\
&\le\sum_{\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}|\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)|^{-1}e^{-nH(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)+n\vartheta_2^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}\\
&\le e^{-n\inf_{\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}H(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)+n\vartheta_2^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}. \qquad (3.11)
\end{aligned}$$

The corresponding lower bound is

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big\{M\in\Gamma\,\Big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\Big\}&=\sum_{\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\big\{M=\nu_n\,\big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\big\}\\
&\ge e^{-n\inf_{\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}H(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)}\sum_{\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}e^{\vartheta_1^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}\\
&\ge e^{-n\inf_{\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}H(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)+n\vartheta_1^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}. \qquad (3.12)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\vartheta_2^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)=0$ and $\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\vartheta_1^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)=0$ (by [DM06a, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.4]), the normalized logarithmic limits of (3.11) and (3.12) gives

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\tfrac{1}{n}\log\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big\{M\in\Gamma\,\Big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\Big\}=-\liminf_{n\to\infty}\Big\{\inf_{\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}H(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)\Big\} \qquad (3.13)$$

and

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\tfrac{1}{n}\log\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big\{M\in\Gamma\,\Big|\,\Phi(M)=(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\Big\}=-\limsup_{n\to\infty}\Big\{\inf_{\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)}H(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)\Big\} \qquad (3.14)$$

The upper bound in (3.3) follows from (3.13) , as $\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)\subset\Gamma$ for all n.

Now fix $\nu\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X}))$. Then, by [DM06a, Lemma 4.9], there exists a sequence $\nu_n\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)$ such that $\nu_n\to\nu$ as $n\to\infty$. Therefore, by continuity of entropy, see, example [DM06a, p.19, equation 14] we have that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\Big\{\inf_{\nu^{'}\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)} H(\nu^{'}\,\|\,Q_n)\Big\}\le\lim_{n\to\infty}H(\nu_n\,\|\,Q_n)=H(\nu\,\|\,Q).$$

Recall that $H(\nu\,\|\,Q)=\infty$ whenever, for some $(a,\ell)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{X})$, $\nu(a,\ell)>0$ while $Q(a,\ell)=0$. Hence, by the preceding inequality we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\Big\{\inf_{\nu^{'}\in\Gamma\cap\mathcal{K}^{(n)}(\omega_n,\varpi_n)} H(\nu^{'}\,\|\,Q_n)\Big\}\le\inf_{\nu\in int(\Gamma)}H(\nu\,\|\,Q),$$

which gives the lower bound in (3.3). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

References

[Be62] G. Bennett. Probability Inequalities for the Sum of Independent Random Variables *Journal of the American Statistical Association 57 (297): 3345. doi:10.2307/2282438 (1962)*

[BGL02] S. Boucheron, F. Gamboa and C. Leonard. Bins and balls: Large deviations of the empirical occupancy process. *Ann. Appl. Probab. 12 607-636 (2002).*

[CP03] C. Cannings and D.B. Penman. Models of random graphs and their applications *Handbook of Statistics 21. Stochastic Processes: Modeling and Simulation.* Eds: D.N. Shanbhag and C.R. Rao. Elsevier (2003) 51-91.

[DA06] K. Doku-Amponsah. Large deviations and basic information theory for hierarchical and networked data structures. PhD Thesis, Bath (2006).

[DA10] K. Doku-Amponsah. Asymptotic equipartition properties for hierarchical and networked structures. ESAIM:*Probability and Statistics.*DOI: 10.1051/ps/2010016 : Published online by Cambridge University Press: 03 February 2011.

[DM06a] K. Doku-Amponsah and P. Mörters. Large deviation principle for empirical measures of coloured random graphs. *The annals of Applied Probability,* 20,6 (2010),1989-2021.

[DMS03] A. Dembo, P. Mörters and S. Sheffield. Large deviations of Markov chains indexed by random trees. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré: Probab.et Stat.41,* (2005) 971-996.

[DZ98] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. Large deviations techniques and applications. Springer, New York, (1998).

[Fe67] W. Feller. An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. I, Wiley, New York. Third edition, (1967).

[New00] M. E. Newman. Random graphs as models of networks. *http://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0202208*

[OC98] N. O'Connell. Some large deviation results for sparse random graphs. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **110** 277–285 (1998).

[PC11] I. C. Paschalidis and Yin Chen. Anomaly dection in sensor networks based on large deviations of Markov chain models. *Decision and Control, 2008. CDC 2008. 47th IEEE Conference*

[Pe98] D.B. Penman. Random graphs with correlation structure. PhD Thesis, Sheffield 1998.

[Si58] M. Sion. On general Minimax theorems. Pacific J. Math. 8 171-176 1958.